

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-9 remain in this application as amended herein, claims 10-20 are cancelled, and claims 21-33 are added. Accordingly, claims 1-9 and 21-33 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the dependency of claim 18. Claim 18 is cancelled.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lytle (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0188683 A1). Claims 10-20 are cancelled. It is submitted that the remaining claims are patentably distinguishable over the reference.

The Lytle publication describes a method of generating custom forms that are used when creating and sending electronic mail. When a user wishes to send an e-mail message, the user opens a new e-mail message and decides whether to use one of the previously installed forms or create a custom form. If the user decides to design a custom form, the user selects one or more fields from a list of fields or creates one or more new fields that are added to create the custom form. (See also Figs. 19-21; and ¶¶ [0006]-[0007], [0030], [0194]-[0199], and [0202]-[0205]). Lytle does not disclose or suggest that a previously installed form is *associated with* a respective one of a plurality of portions of *multimedia content data*, and the publication does not disclose or suggest that a previously installed form includes a specific e-mail message format *that corresponds to* a respective portion of *multimedia content data*.

Therefore, Lytle does not disclose or suggest:

a second storage unit operable to store a plurality of mail templates each associated with a respective one of a plurality of portions of second multimedia content data and each including a specific

e-mail message format corresponding to that portion of the second multimedia content data

as set out in claim 1.

Further, because Lytle is not concerned with forms that associated with multimedia content data, the publication neither discloses nor suggests reading out a previously installed form *that is associated with a previously played-back portion of multimedia content data.*

Lytle therefore does not disclose or suggest:

an e-mail message forming unit operable to read out a particular one of the plurality of mail templates that is associated with a previously played-back portion of the second multimedia content data, to obtain a portion of the first multimedia content data based on a user selection, and to insert the selected portion of the first multimedia content data into an e-mail message, the selected portion of the first multimedia content data being arranged within the e-mail message according to the specific e-mail message format of the read-out mail template

as set out in claim 1.

It follows that Lytle does not disclose or suggest the combination called for in claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate the claim.

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1 and, for at least the same reasons, are distinguishable over the cited reference.

Independent claim 4 relates to a method of forming an e-mail message and calls for:

storing a plurality of mail templates each associated with a respective one of a plurality of portions of second multimedia content data and each including a specific e-mail message format corresponding to that portion of the second multimedia content data;

and further calls for:

reading out a particular one of the plurality of mail templates that is associated with a previously

played-back portion of the second multimedia content data[.]

At least for the reasons set out above regarding claim 1, claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over Lytle.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 4 and are distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 7 defines a computer readable storage medium having a computer program stored therein for carrying out the method of claim 4. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over Lytle.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7 and are distinguishable over the cited reference at least for the same reasons.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested.

New claims 21-22 and 27-29 define an electronic mail system, new claims 23-24 and 30-31 define a method of forming an e-mail message, and new claims 25-26 and 32-33 define a computer-readable storage medium. Each of new claims 21-33 is distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the reasons set out above regarding claim 1. Support for new claims 21-26 is found, e.g., in ¶¶ [0086]-[0097] of the specification. Support for new claim 27-33 is found, e.g., in ¶¶ [0098]-[0100] of the specification.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 10/075,875

Docket No.: SCEI 3.0-120

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 6, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

590093_1.DOC